DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 055 TM 850 530

AUTHOR Golub, Lester S.
TITLE The Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of a Bilingual Placement and Monitoring Center.
PUB DATE Oct 84
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; *Bilingual Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Immigrants; Language Proficiency; *Limited English Speaking; Mathematics Achievement; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Pupil Personnel Services; Reading Achievement; *Student Placement; Test Results
IDENTIFIERS Lancaster School District PA

ABSTRACT

In 1981, the Bilingual Placement and Monitoring Instructional Support System (BPMIS) Center in the School District of Lancaster (Pennsylvania) was established. Partially supported by Title VII funds, the Center provides comprehensive services to assure sound educational placement, continuous monitoring, successful transition into all English-medium instructional classes, and effective counseling and support services to limited English proficient (LEP) students (Puerto Rican and Indochinese immigrants) and the instructional staff. The BPMIS Center program was evaluated in terms of the performance objectives for each of the first three years of implementations. Pretests and posttest scores in the Language Assessment Battery and the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills were used to analyze pupil linguistics and academic achievement. Questionnaires and interview schedules were used where qualitative judgements were required. Previous evaluations of the bilingual education program had not produced favorable pupil achievement. Pupils having BPMIS Center treatment showed significant linguistic and academic achievement. When transferred to the all-English program, they achieved reading and mathematics scores at grade and class level. Test scores are summarized in 28 tables. (Author/BS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262055

THE DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF A BILINGUAL PLACEMENT AND MONITORING CENTER

Lester S. Golub
Dean, School of Education
Baruch College
The City University of New York

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Golub, Lester S.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TM 850 530

ABSTRACT

The Design, Implementation and Evaluation of a Bilingual Placement and Monitoring Center -

LESTER S. GOLUB, Dean
School of Education
Baruch College, City University of New York

The objectives of the design, implementation, and evaluation of the BPMIS Center were: 1) to select instruments for determining entry and exit criteria to and from bilingual education; 2) to develop and validate instruments for monitoring pupils' linguistic and academic achievement for reclassification to all-English programs; 3) to monitor transition students in the all-English program. Previous evaluations of the bilingual education program had not produced favorable pupil achievement. Pupils who had the BPMIS Center treatment showed significant linguistic and academic achievement, and when transferred to the all-English program, achieved reading and mathematics scores at grade and class level.

The Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of a Bilingual Placement and Monitoring Center

Lester S. Golub
Dean, School of Education
Baruch College
The City University of New York

INTRODUCTION

After more than a decade of bilingual education for Puerto Rican and Vietnamese immigrant children, in 1980, the school District of Lancaster in the southeastern tier of Pennsylvania, decided that Bilingual Education was not enough to make an educational difference in linguistic and academic achievement of these children. Some troubling questions remained: How do we know that the right children have been properly placed in the Bilingual Education program? How do we know that the children are making optimum linguistic and academic achievement while in the Bilingual Education program? How do we know that progressing students are being promoted out of the Bilingual Education program and are making a successful transition into the all-English medium program? Why do beginning of the year (pretest) scores compared to end of year (posttest) scores not show a significant gain? What was certainly needed was a bilingual placement and monitoring system. In 1980, a proposal for a Bilingual Placement and Monitoring Instructional Support (BPMIS) Center was written and submitted. Title VII funds were awarded to partially support, for three years, the Center. By the time school opened in September, 1981, the BPMIS Center was in place and receiving pupils.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Recurrent criticisms of bilingual education are that there are no criteria for selecting those who go into the program, those who go in either stay not long enough or too long, and those who go in are lost in the program

thus resulting in unaccountable progress or failure. The BPMIS Center was devised to counteract these criticisms. The basic aims of the Center are: 1) to place immigrant children at their appropriate level in the Bilingual Education program; 2) to monitor immigrant student progress so that they are reclassified and assisted in their transition into the all-English medium program, assuring that they remain at grade level in English reading and mathematics and that they can compete academically with their classmates by the end of the first year of transition.

Another reason for creating a BPMIS Center rather than tampering further with the bilingual education instructional program was that for the past decade many published innovations in bilingual education/instructional methodology had been tried with no significant changes between beginning of the year and end of the year English language tests scores. Two or more years of any instructional methodology were needed before these differences occurred. If instructional methodology could be discarded, given the dedication and training of the teachers and the time and money given the Bilingual Education program, the researcher hypothesized that careful monitoring should give the evaluators a clue to who was progressing and who was not progressing in the program.

DESCRIPTION OF THE BPMIS CENTER

The BPMIS Center has now been in existence for three years. For this reason, the discussion of the description of the BPMIS Center program will deal with a general description of the total program as it has developed over the past three years followed by a description of the performance objective for each of the three phases of the program.

General description of the BPMIS Center

Large numbers of Puerto Rican families have been arriving in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, since 1965. More recently, Indochinese families have arrived

directly into the School District of Lancaster area. The School District of Lancaster has responded to the needs of limited English proficiency (LEP) students by providing,with local funds, a program of comprehensive services including:

.K-12th grade bilingual education classes

.K-12th grade ESL classes

.Bilingual/ESL Materials Resource Library

.Inservice education programs for teachers and staff (credit and certification)

.Bilingual counselor and counseling services

.Bilingual materials resource specialist

.Summer curriculum development

.Enrollment/Orientation Center for non-English speaking families.

In 1981, the Bilingual Placement and Monitoring Support (BPMIS) Center was established and partially supported by Title VII funds in order to provide comprehensive services which assure sound educational placement, continuous monitoring, successful transition into all-English medium instructional classes, and effective counseling and support services to limited English proficient students and the instructional staff.

The activities and services of the BPMIS Center include:

.Identify students within the School District of Lancaster whose proficiency in English or their native language requires placement in an English as a Second Language, ESL, or bilingual education program.

.Monitor LEP pupils' academic achievement after initial placement in a bilingual education or an ESL program.

.Review of LEP pupils' achievement so that appropriate programs and support services can be provided during participation in the Bilingual Education or the ESL program.

.Reclassify LEP pupils from the Bilingual Education or the ESL program into the regular, all-English medium instruction program.

.Monitor LEP pupils who have made the transition from a Bilingual Education or an ESL program to a regular, all-English medium instruction program to assure proper placement and function of those pupils.

.Communicate with classroom teachers, guidance counselors, parents, and social service agencies the needs of special LEP pupils.

.Direct teachers to instructional materials, tests, and techniques which enhance LEP pupils' English proficiency.

.Conduct workshops and seminars which assist teachers in the development or identification of materials, techniques, and classroom assessment instruments appropriate for LEP pupils.

The BPMIS Center, through its English, Spanish, and Vietnamese speaking staff, had contact with pupils, parents, counselors, and classroom teachers in a variety of programs including bilingual education, English as a Second Language, foreign languages, Spanish for Spanish speakers, and the regular all-English medium program. The BPMIS Center has made a significant impact on the quality of instructional approaches being used with LEP students.

OBJECTIVES

Each year of the implementation of the BPMIS Center, 1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84 had one enabling objective (goal) and five to seven performance objectives for each goal. The enabling objective for Phase I, Year 1 (1981-82) was to select and implement a battery of tests to be used for

determining entry and exit criteria to and from the bilingual education program. The enabling objective for Phase II, Year 2 (1982-83) was to develop and validate instruments for monitoring pupils' linguistic and academic achievement in order to reclassify pupils to the all-English medium program. The enabling objective for Phase III, Year 3 (1983-84) was to monitor transitional students during their first year in the all-English medium program.

Performance Objectives: Phase I, Year 1, 1981-82

The performance objectives for the BPMIS Center for Phase I, Year 1, 1981-82 were the following:

1. To develop and field test a battery of tests and to establish realistic criterion levels to use for the academic assessment of pupils referred for testing to the BPMIS Center.
2. To determine the English language proficiency of all entering LEP pupils at the beginning of the school year and at the end of the school year using the Language Assessment Battery (LAB).
3. To determine pupils who are ready to exit the Bilingual Education or ESL program or are to remain a second year.
4. To develop or recommend materials and strategies for entering Bilingual Education and ESL pupils through workshops and conferences for teachers and staff.
5. To prepare a trilingual English, Spanish, Vietnamese, orientation booklet for all students and their parents referred for entry to the BPMIS Center.

Pupils remain in the Bilingual Education or the ESL program another year if they fall between the 20-40 percentile in the LAB posttest and show no gain in the cloze test. No pupil is expected to remain longer than three years in the Bilingual Education/ESL program without special support.

Performance Objectives: Phase II, Year 2, 1982-83

The performance objectives for the BPMIS Center for Phase II,Year 2, 1982-83 were the following:

1. To maintain the academic achievement levels of LEP pupils who have gone through the BPMIS Center and who have been placed in Bilingual Education/ ESL programs.
2. To develop and to implement a monitoring procedure of pupils who have entered the Bilingual Education/ESL program and to identify nonprogressing pupils who need special education procedures.
3. To develop and to implement exit and reclassification procedures for pupils who have entered the Bilingual Education/ESL program via the BPMIS Center, who have been successful achievers, and who are now ready to exit the Bilingual Education/ESL program and to be reclassified as pupils in the all-English medium instruction program.
4. To conduct workshops for the BPMIS Center staff.

Performance Objectives: Phase III, Year 3, 1983-84

The performance objectives for the BPMIS Center for Phase III, Year 3, 1983-84 were the following:

1. To assess the achievement of LEP students who have made the transition from the Bilingual Education or the ESL program to the all-English medium program.
2. To revise the monitoring instrument, the Pupil Observation Scale, POS, to allow classroom teachers to evaluate the progress of BPMIS students who have achieved exit criterion and have been placed in all-English medium classrooms.

3. To explain the exit criteria assessment, monitoring instrument, and transition procedures to teachers and administrators of receiving schools.
4. To develop procedures with transition schools which will serve to orient transition students and their parents to policies, procedures, and goals of the all-English medium instructional program.
5. To develop instructional material and strategies which all-English medium teachers can use with transitional students.

EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The evaluation design used an eclectic model derived from the pretest-posttest comparison design, the experimental-control group comparison design, the criterion level attainment design, and the discrepancy design. In conducting a program evaluation, established school procedures take dominance and reflect the school environment as it actually exists. In the process of assessing pupil achievement, the tests used within the school district were used for assessing pupil achievement. The scores of transition students were compared to the scores of a random sample of students similar in socioeconomic background but who had not had the English language barrier or had not gone through the BPMIS procedures. Each year, the enabling objectives were carefully analyzed and realistic tasks were selected to evaluate the objectives.

Evaluation Tasks: Phase I, Year 1

The tasks performed for the BPMIS Center evaluation, Phase I, Year 1, were the following:

1. Pupil Achievement

The Language Assessment Battery (LAB) was used to assess: 1) listening/understanding, 2) speaking, 3) reading, 4) writing in English

of Puerto Rican and Vietnamese LEP pupils. Scores of randomly selected pupils in two groups were compared: 1) experimental group--pupils who entered the School District of Lancaster Bilingual Education program in 1981-82 via the BPMIS Center as established under Title VII; and 2) control group--pupils who in 1980-81, entered the School District of Lancaster Bilingual Education program through procedures other than the Title VII, BPMIS Center.

2. Perceptions of the Program: Parents/Community; Teachers/Counselors perceptions of the program were obtained from two groups: 1) parents and community persons and 2) teachers and counselors. A bilingual questionnaire (Spanish/English and Vietnamese/English) was administered to parents and interested community persons. An English questionnaire was administered to educational personnel. The results were assessed by establishing a predetermined criterion level. Learning and Evaluation Associates developed and validated the questionnaires which were administered by the BPMIS Center staff.

3. Appropriateness of Placement and Instructional Support: Learning and Evaluation Associates developed an observation instrument to determine the successful placement of pupils placed into the Bilingual Education program by the BPMIS Center. The comparison of this observation instrument with pupil achievement on the LAB served to determine the degree of appropriate placement and instructional support of pupils who were given classroom assignments through the BPMIS Center.

4. Workshops and Staff Development: Workshops and staff development for assisting Bilingual Education and ESL teachers in receiving and teaching pupils were conducted through the BPMIS Center. Learning and Evaluation Associates developed and analyzed the instrument used for the evaluation of the workshops.

The four questionnaires and observation instruments were developed co-operatively by Learning and Evaluation Associates and the BPMIS Center staff for use in this evaluation.

Evaluation Tasks: Phase II, Year 2

The tasks performed for the BPMIS Center evaluation, 1982-83, Phase II, Year 2 were the following:

1. Pupil Academic Achievement

The Language Assessment Battery was used to assess: 1) listening/understanding, 2) speaking, 3) reading, and 4) writing in English of Puerto Rican and Vietnamese LEP pupils who entered the School District of Lancaster via the BPMIS Center. Pretest (Fall of 1982) and Posttest (Spring of 1983) of randomly selected, progressing pupils who entered the program in 1982-83 were compared at grade levels K-2, 3-6, and 7-12.

2. Monitoring Procedures

Since this aspect of the evaluation is procedural, the evaluator examined:

1. Entries, moves and exits to and from the program.
2. Student Evaluation Record Forms.
3. Monthly logs of Title VII guidance counselor.
4. Nonprogressing students, 1982 and 1983.

3. Exit and Reclassification Procedures

Since this aspect of the evaluation is procedural, the evaluator examined the results of the Reclassification Pupil Observation Scale used on pupils who had been reclassified from the BE/ESL program to the regular English program.

4. Staff Development Workshops

At the end of each workshop, participants completed an evaluation form. These evaluations were tabulated after the staff participants rated their own workshops.

Evaluation Tasks: Phase III, Year 3

The tasks performed for the BPMIS Center evaluation, Phase III, Year 3, were the following:

1. Pupil achievement in all-English medium. To assess the academic achievement of transition students in the all-English medium program.

Evaluation task

.To compare the English reading and mathematics achievement Iowa scores of pupils who have entered the all-English medium program via the BPMIS Center with those who have not.

2. Evaluate monitoring instrument. To revise the monitoring instrument, the Pupil Observation Scale, POS, to allow classroom teachers to evaluate the process of students who have achieved exit criteria of the Bilingual Education/ESL Program and who have been placed in all-English medium classrooms.

Evaluation tasks

.To analyze the rate of retention in the all-English medium program and to determine a criterion level on the POS for retention in the all-English program.

.To analyze the ease of administration and interpretation of the Pupil Observation Scale.

3. Assistance to receiving teachers. To explain the exit criteria assessment, monitoring instrument, and transition procedures to teachers of receiving schools.

Evaluation tasks

.To analyze the set of guidelines prepared by the BPMIS Center for receiving teachers in methodology and materials adaptation.

.To analyze receiving school perceptions of clarity and utility of exit criteria assessment, monitoring instrument, and transition procedures.

4. Orientation of transition parents and students. To develop procedures with transition schools which will serve to orient transition students and their parents to policies, procedures, and goals of the all-English medium program.

Evaluation tasks

.To analyze the content validity of the orientation procedure.

.To analyze the parent response and involvement in orientation workshops.

.To analyze the effectiveness of an audio-visual presentation prepared by the BPMIS Center staff for transition students and their parents.

5. Instructional materials, strategies, workshops. To develop or provide instructional materials and strategies which all-English medium receiving teachers can use with transitional students.

Evaluation procedures

.To analyze receiving teachers' perceptions of workshops prepared for them by the BPMIS Center on the use of instructional materials and strategies.

.To analyze the instructional materials and strategies for their appropriateness to the all-English medium classroom.

DATA SOURCE

The purpose of the evaluation design and methodology was to determine whether the enabling objectives of each year were being accomplished and the degree to which they were accomplished. In analyzing pupil linguistic and academic achievement, pretest and posttest scores on the Language Assessment Battery, and the Iowa achievement tests were used. In cases where qualitative judgements were required,questionnaires and interview schedules were used. The evaluation instruments for collecting data had to be familiar to the school district administrators and teachers.

RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

The results of the evaluation will be presented in summary form. The objective will be stated with an evaluation of objective, on a 1-5 scale. Following the evaluator's assessment of the objectives, some tables will be presented which will analyze pupil achievement over the three year development and implementation of the BPMIS Center.

Results: Phase I, Year 1

Objective 1:

To determine start of year and end of year English language proficiency (pretest and posttest) of pupils received at the BPMIS Center.

Rating: Very good - 4

Objective 2:

To establish criterion levels for entry and exit of the School District of Lancaster Bilingual Education/ESL program for pupils received at the BPMIS Center.

Rating: Very good - 4

Objective 3:

To specify grade levels and to monitor pupils placed in the Bilingual Education/ESL program.

Rating: Excellent - 5

Objective 4:

To conduct workshops for bilingual education teachers and counselors informing them of the nature and results of the Bilingual Education Placement and Monitoring Instructional Service (BPMIS) Center.

Rating: Good - 3

Objective 5:

To orient entering LEP pupils and their parents to the School District of Lancaster, its programs, and its community resources.

Rating: Excellent - 5

Results: Phase II, Year 2

Objective 1:

To maintain the academic achievement of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) pupils who have gone through the BPMIS Center and who have been placed in Bilingual Education/ESL programs.

Rating: Very good to excellent - 4.8

Objective 2:

To develop and implement a monitoring procedure of pupils who have entered the Bilingual Education/ESL program via the BPMIS Center, particularly for identifying nonprogressing pupils.

Rating: Excellent - 5

Objective 3:

To develop and to implement exit and reclassification procedures of pupils who have entered the Bilingual Education/ESL (BE/ESL) program via the BPMIS Center, who have been successful achievers, and who are now ready to exit the BE/ESL program and to be reclassified as pupils in the monolingual English instructional programs.

Rating: Excellent - 5

Objective 4:

To conduct workshops for the BPMIS Center staff which facilitates the accomplishment of the above three objectives.

Rating: Very good to excellent - 4.5

Results: Phase III, Year 3

Objective 1:

To assess the academic achievement of transitionsl students in the all-English medium program.

Rating: Excellent - 5

Objective 2:

To revise the Pupil Observation Scale so that receiving teachers of transitional students in the all-English medium program can use it successfully.

Rating: Very good to excellent - 4.5

Objective 3:

To explain the exit criteria assessment and monitoring instruments, and transition procedures to teachers of receiving schools.

Rating: Very good - 4

Objective 4:

To orient transitional students and their parents to policies, procedures, and goals of the all-English medium program.

Rating: Very good to excellent - 4.5

Objective 5:

To present instructional materials and strategies to all-English medium program receiving teachers.

Rating: Very good - 4

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT - TABLES

In the final analysis, pupil achievement is the "bottom-line" of any educational program; some tables are presented here to show pupil progress.

Tables, Pupil Achievement, Phase I, Year 1

The tables here show pretest and posttest pupil achievement on the listening/speaking, reading, and writing portions of the English LAB. Notice that significant differences are relatively few.

Table 1

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the Listening/Speaking Subtest (English) of the LAB, Level I, Grades K-2

	Pretest			Posttest			
Source	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
Kindergarten	85	10.65	5.35	64	11.67	5.99	$p > .05$
First Grade	76	14.23	4.94	56	14.66	4.87	ns
Second Grade	52	16.31	4.48	32	15.56	4.80	ns

Table 2

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the Reading Subtest (English) of the LAB, Level 1, Grades K-2

	Pretest			Posttest			
Source	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
Kindergarten	85	.82	1.85	64	.66	2.27	ns
First Grade	74	1.59	2.27	56	1.36	1.85	ns
Second Grade	52	3.98	3.16	32	5.19	3.08	$p < .05$

Table 3

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the Writing Subtest (English) of the LAB, Level I, Grades K-2

	Pretest			Posttest			
Source	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
Kindergarten	85	1.05	1.82	64	.52	1.41	ns
First Grade	74	2.38	1.78	56	2.98	1.94	ns
Second Grade	52	5.50	2.41	32	5.82	2.17	ns

Table 4

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the Listening Subtest (English) of the LAB, Level II, Grades 3-6

	Pretest			Posttest			
Source	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
Third grade	23	17.26	6.81	25	17.00	6.76	ns
Fourth Grade	37	20.00	5.65	33	19.33	4.95	ns
Fifth Grade	25	21.88	3.96	33	21.58	6.25	ns
Sixth Grade	14	23.71	2.67	19	21.47	6.85	ns

Table 5

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the
Speaking Subtest (English) of the
LAB, Level II, Grades 3-6

	Pretest			Posttest			
Source	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
Third Grade	23	5.35	3.3	25	5.28	3.49	ns
Fourth Grade	37	6.32	4.25	33	5.70	3.75	ns
Fifth Grade	25	7.04	3.53	33	8.91	4.18	$p > .05$
Sixth Grade	14	8.71	3.12	19	7.42	4.02	$p > .05$

Table 6

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the
Reading Subtest (English) of the
LAB, Level II, Grades 3-6

	Pretest			Posttest			
Source	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
Third Grade	23	5.65	2.71	25	7.00	4.83	$p > .05$
Fourth Grade	37	10.76	5.79	33	11.48	6.23	ns
Fifth Grade	25	11.32	6.44	33	13.15	6.03	$p > .05$
Sixth Grade	14	14.50	6.77	19	16.26	5.73	ns

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the
Writing Subtest (English) of the
LAB, Level II, Grades 3-6

	Pretest			Posttest			
Source	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
Third Grade	23	5.30	3.05	25	5.36	4.76	ns
Fourth Grade	37	9,73	5.3	33	10.12	4.44	ns
Fifth Grade	25	11.28	5.69	33	12.52	4.86	ns
Sixth Grade	14	14.71	5.76	19	13.05	4.90	ns

Table 8

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the
Listening Subtest (English) of the
LAB, Level III, Grades 7-12

	Pretest			Posttest			
Source	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
Seventh Grade	17	15.82	2.98	24	16.63	1.86	ns
Eighth Grade	16	16.06	4.37	24	15.66	3.17	ns
Ninth Grade	15	16.87	2.42	16	16.94	2.91	ns
Tenth Grade	15	14.33	3.99	38	12.97	5.06	ns
Eleventh Grade	23	16.69	3.56	28	15.21	4.11	ns
Twelfth Grade	13	15.77	4.71	16	18.25	2.69	ns

Table 9

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the Speaking Subtest (English) of the LAB, Level III, Grades 7-12

	Pretest			Posttest			
Source	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
Seventh Grade	17	5.35	2.64	24	6.17	3.58	ns
Eighth Grade	16	6.50	4.23	24	7.13	4.18	ns
Ninth Grade	15	6.33	2.81	16	6.56	3.03	ns
Tenth Grade	15	5.07	3.61	38	4.37	4.14	ns
Eleventh Grade	23	6.83	3.55	28	6.04	3.25	ns
Twelfth Grade	13	7.15	3.39	16	10.13	2.36	$p>.01$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 10

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the
Reading Subtest (English) of the
LAB, Level III, Grades 7-12

	Pretest			Posttest			
Source	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	P
Seventh Grade	17	10.71	3.35	24	12.50	4.50	P>.05
Eighth Grade	16	12.06	4.93	24	12.08	3.91	ns
Ninth Grade	15	14.40	5.46	16	12.38	4.84	ns
Tenth Grade	15	10.87	3.44	38	11.61	5.37	ns
Eleventh Grade	23	14.26	5.57	28	14.11	3.95	ns
Twelfth Grade	13	17.46	5.94	16	18.06	5.51	ns

Table 11

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the
Writing Subtest (English) of the
LAB, Level III, Grades 7-12

	Pretest			Posttest			
Source	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	P
Seventh Grade	17	9.82	4.20	24	10.25	4.52	ns
Eighth Grade	16	10.81	4.77	24	10.54	4.28	ns
Ninth Grade	15	12.46	4.36	16	11.25	4.09	ns
Tenth Grade	15	9.53	4.55	38	10.92	5.57	ns
Eleventh Grade	23	10.39	4.66	28	13.89	4.36	P>.01
Twelfth Grade	13	11.62	5.07	16	14.75	4.12	ns

Tables, Pupil Achievement, Phase II, Year 2

The tables presented here show that by the time the second year of the BPMIS Center was implemented, there were significant LAB pretest and posttest scores throughout the grades.

Table 12

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the Listening/Speaking Subtest (English) of the LAB, Level I, Grades K-2

	Pretest			Posttest			
Grade level	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
K -2	25	9.08	4.10	25	16.44	2.65	$p>.01$

Table 13

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the Reading Subtest (English) of the LAB, Level II, Grades K-2

	Pretest			Posttest			
Grade level	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
K-2	25	.55	1.19	25	4.24	4.41	$p>.01$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 14

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the

Writing Subtest (English) of the

LAB, Level I, Grades K-2

	Pretest			Posttest			
Grade Level	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
K-2	25	1.08	1.75	25	5.88	2.33	$p>.001$

Table 15

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the

Listening/Speaking Subtest (English) of the

LAB, Level II, Grades 3-6

	Pretest			Posttest			
Grade Level	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
3-6	28	15.75	4.72	28	19.68	5.07	$p>.01$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 16

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the

Reading Subtest (English) of the

LAB, Level II, Grades 3-6

	Pretest			Posttest			
Grade Level	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
3-6	28	8.25	4.27	28	12.5	4.90	$p>.01$

Table 17

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the

Writing Subtest (English) of the

LAB, Level II, Grades 3-6

	Pretest			Posttest			
Grade Level	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
3-6	28	6.82	3.52	28	12	4.20	$p>.01$

Table 18

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the

Listening/Speaking Subtest (English) of the

LAB, Level III, Grades 7-12

	Pretest			Posttest			
Grade Level	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
7-12	35	3.86	3.60	35	7.14	4.27	$p>.01$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 19

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the

Reading Subtest (English) of the

LAB, Level III, Grades 7-12

	Pretest			Posttest			
Grade Level	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
7-12	35	9.54	3.93	35	12.18	5.43	$p>.05$

Table 20

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the

Writing Subtest (English) of the

LAB, Level III, Grades 7-12

	Pretest			Posttest			
Grade Level	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	p
7-12	35	7.43	4.13	35	10.74	4.99	$p>.01$

Tables, Pupil Achievement, Phase III, Year 3

By the third year of the implementation of the BPMIS Center, the transitional students (students who had gone through the BPMIS Center, the Bilingual Education program, and had made the transition into the all-English medium classroom) were compared with the nontransitional students (primarily native speakers of English in the same classrooms). The end of grade scores used were the Iowa scores on reading and mathematics.

Notice that what is looked for here are nonsignificant differences, assuming that transitional students will do as well as nontranitional students on reading and mathematics Iowa scores at grade level.

Table 21

Comparison of Transitional and Nontransitional Students' Iowa Scores, Reading, Grade 3

Grade 3	Transitional					Nontransitional				
		G.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$				G.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$		
	n			sd	df	n			sd	p
	5	2.8	17.2	4.8	23	20	3.1	19.6	4.3	NS

G.E. = Grade Equivalent

R.S. = Raw Score

p = .05 level of significance

Table 22

Comparison of Transitional and Nontransitional Students' Iowa Scores, Mathematics, Grade 3

Grade 3	Transitional					Nontransitional				
		G.E.	R.S.				G.E.	R.S.		
	n	x	x	sd	df	n	x	x	sd	p
	4	3.35	47.5	8.5	22	20	3.8	57.6	9.9	significant at .05 level

G.E. = Grade Equivalent

R.S. = Raw Score

p = .05 level of significance

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 23

Comparison of Transitional and Nontransitional Students' Iowa Scores, Reading, Grade 4

Grade 4	Transitional					Nontransitional				
		C.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$				C.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$		
	n			sd	df	n			sd	p
	11	3.3	16.4	2.35	29	20	3.5	17.8	2.9	NS

C.E. = Grade Equivalent

R.S. = Raw Score

p = .05 level of significance

Table 24

Comparison of Transitional and Nontransitional Students' Iowa Scores, Mathematics, Grade 4

Grade 4	Transitional					Nontransitional				
		C.E.	R.S.				C.E.	R.S.		
	n	x	x	sd	df	n	x	x	sd	p
	12	4.0	48.3	9.5	30	20	4.0	48.5	12.7	NS

C.E. = Grade Equivalent

R.S. = Raw Score

p = .05 level of significance

Table 25

Comparison of Transitional and Nontransitional Students' Iowa Scores, Reading, Grade 5

Grade 5	Transitional					Nontransitional				
		G.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$				G.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$		
	n			sd	df	n			sd	p
	7	4.8	22.9	6.7	30	25	4.4	20.1	3.6	NS

G.E. = Grade Equivalent

R.S. = Raw Score

p = .05 level of significance

Table 26

Comparison of Transitional and Nontransitional Students' Iowa Scores, Mathematics, Grade 5

Grade 5	Transitional					Nontransitional				
		G.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$				G.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$		
	n			sd	df	n			sd	p
	7	5.2	58.6	12.8	30	25	4.8	51.2	8.8	significant at .05 level

G.E. = Grade Equivalent

R.S. = Raw Score

p = .05 level of significance

Table 27

Comparison of Transitional and Nontransitional Students' Iowa Scores, Reading, Grade 6

Grade 6	Transitional					Nontransitional				
		G.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$				G.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$		
	n			sd	df	n			sd	p
	8	5.1	21.3	7.8	30	24	5.1	22.5	6.3	NS

G.E. = Grade Equivalent

R.S. = Raw Score

p = .05 level of significance

Table 28

Comparison of Transitional and Nontransitional Students' Iowa Scores, Mathematics, Grade 6

Grade 6	Transitional					Nontransitional				
		G.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$				G.E. $\bar{x}$	R.S. $\bar{x}$		
	n			sd	df	n			sd	p
	8	6.0	57	13.8	30	24	6.1	57.7	16	NS

G.E. = Grade Equivalent

R.S. = Raw Score

p = .05 level of significance

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONCLUSIONS

The two outstanding conclusions of this evaluation show that: 1) limited-English Proficiency students who were tested, placed and monitored by the BPMIS Center and who spent time in the Bilingual Educational program, showed significant pretest (beginning of year) and posttest (end of year) English language skills at the second year of the program. 2) Transition LEP pupils who had the BPMIS treatment and placed in the all-English medium program achieved grade level scores and were on a par with their classmates in reading and mathematics.

Both of these conclusions would not be outstanding if over the past ten years these results had been attained by doing the same types of measurements with students who had only gone through the bilingual education instruction program. These results had never been attainable in previous evaluations. Other outcomes of this evaluation such as implementation of a testing battery and monitoring instruments were also made available through this evaluation procedure.

This design, implementation, and evaluation of a Bilingual Placement and Monitoring Center shows that for efficient educational practices, a bilingual education instructional program for immigrant children is not enough. These children, their parents, and their teachers need a support system that will effectively monitor and assist their progress during the first two or three transition years as they accommodate to a new language, new society, and a new educational system.